

## ***FINAL MINUTES***

### ***KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING***

***June 28-29, 2000  
Best Western Bayshore Inn  
Eureka, CA***

June 28, 2000

#### **Agendum 1. Convene and Opening Remarks**

##### **Representative Seat**

California Commercial Salmon Industry  
California Department of Fish and Game  
California In-River Sport Fishing Community  
Del Norte County  
Hoopa Valley Tribe  
Humboldt County  
Karuk Tribe  
Klamath County  
Klamath Tribe  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Siskiyou County  
Trinity County  
U.S. Department of Interior/Task Force Chair  
U.S. Department of Agriculture  
Yurok Tribe

##### **Members Present**

Felicia Oldfather (Dave Bitts alternate)  
Mike Rode  
Kent Bulfinch  
Not represented  
Mike Orcutt  
Paul Kirk  
Ronnie Pierce (Leaf Hillman alternate)  
Don Russell  
Elwood Miller, Jr.  
Don Reck  
Keith Wilkinson  
Joan Smith  
Not represented  
John Engbring, Chair  
Robbie Van de Water (Al Olson alternate)  
Dave Hillemeier

The following members were not present: Chris Erikson, Trinity County and Chuck Blackburn, Del Norte County. Mike Rode served as Vice-Chair.

Chair John Engbring made the opening remarks. He said the focus of the meeting would be the sub-basin group presentations and budget issues raised at the previous day's Budget Committee Meeting. Mike Rode congratulated Laurie Simons for her invaluable work on the Task Force meeting minutes and handouts; she thanked the Yreka FWO staff for their assistance.

#### **Agendum 2. Introduction of Congressional staff in attendance**

Senator Dianne Feinstein sent her regrets at not being able to attend the meeting. Her letter outlined recent Federal salmon recovery efforts, including the \$10 million given to the state of California, and distributed by the State of California Resources Agency. This year, President Clinton has requested \$160 million, which Sen. Feinstein supports

#### **Agendum 3a. Business. Adoption of agenda**

Joan Smith raised the issue of a recent lawsuit filed against the BOR regarding Klamath River flows; she expressed concern that members of the Task Force involved in the lawsuit should not be present

at this meeting. Don Russell said fostering cooperation is a guiding principle of the Task Force, but this is difficult when certain members are involved in litigation. John Engbring responded to these comments by saying he believes that Task Force members are able to focus on the common issue of salmon restoration and he would not ask anyone to absent themselves from the meeting. Ronnie Pierce asked that the FY2003 Task Force Restoration Budget Act be included in Agendum 10.

**\*\*Motion\*\* Keith Wilkinson moved to adopt the amended agenda.**

**\*\*Second\*\* Don Russell seconded the motion.**

**\*\*Motion Carried\*\* unanimously. Mike Orcutt was not present.**

### **Agendum 3b. Business. Adoption of minutes from February 2000 meeting**

The following changes were requested for the February 2000 meeting minutes: in Agendum 12c: the 1.83% recision should be corrected to read a 1.38% recision.

**\*\*Motion\*\* Keith Wilkinson moved to adopt the amended minutes of the last meeting.**

**\*\*Second\*\* Don Russell seconded the motion.**

**\*\*Motion Carried\*\* unanimously. Mike Orcutt was not present.**

### **Agendum 3c. Business. Vice-Chair selection for the October 2000 meeting**

Kent Bulfinch will serve as Vice-Chair for the October 2000 meeting.

### **Agendum 4. Brief Review of last meeting actions/general correspondence/program update**

As a brief review of the last meeting, Laurie Simons reviewed the list of assignments and motions from the February 2000 meeting. She then briefly described all pertinent correspondence received and sent since the last meeting (*see Agendum 4 handouts*).

Laurie Simons discussed the background for Agendum 4 handouts G, I and J.

The final version of the "Watercolors" video, produced by the Water Education Foundation and partially funded by the Task Force, will be available in mid-July for Task Force members. Laurie Simons said this is the finished product and it is too late for any changes, although the Foundation is interested in comments from members.

There was much discussion regarding whether the video producers had met the provisions of their agreement with the Task Force. In response to Task Force member questions, John Engbring explained that the intent of the video was to cover water allocation/irrigation issues, salmon fisheries and salmon restoration. He added that usually the funding party can not completely control the outcome of an educational product such as this video. A first rough draft of the video was reviewed by FWS staff and the TWG in May, resulting in a comment letter to the Water Education Foundation that the film was biased towards presenting the views of agriculture in the upper basin (*see Agendum 4, Handout G*). The Water Education Foundation responded to this letter (*see Agendum 4, Handout J*) and provided for review a draft of the

magazine article that appeared in the May-June issue of *Western Water*. (see *Agendum 4, Handout I*). Laurie Simons said, according to the agreement, the script of the video should have been provided early in the process to Task Force members for review.

Laurie is collecting comments on the draft article and will be sending them to the foundation shortly. The Task Force discussed several options, among them paying for the video but blocking the release of it, or not paying for the video and taking legal action. The film cost about \$120,000; the Task Force funded \$40,000 of this. It was agreed that Task Force members should review the final product and, if they want to, send comments to the Water Education Foundation, with copies to the Yreka FWO.

### **Task Force Comments**

- Mike Rode said there should have been an opportunity to review a script earlier in the process. He said he had a negative reaction to the first draft.
- Keith Wilkinson said that compliance to the RFP should be reviewed before funding is given.
- Don Reck said that all outreach and educational items should be reviewed much more carefully, in advance of publication.
- Ron Iverson said he found this video disappointing because there was little understanding of the technical issues. He said if the final version is fairly close to what was promised, the Task Force should pay the Water Education Foundation. He also praised Ronnie Pierce's piece on harvest allocation as an example of a well-done educational piece.
- Ronnie Pierce asked if the Task Force has the option to pay for the video but not release it. This was found to be unfeasible, as the Task Force can not control editorial content.
- Dave Hillemeier said the video producers were invited to come to the Yurok reservation to capture the importance of fishing to the tribes and he was disappointed that this did not happen.

**\*\*Assignment\*\* Yreka FWO will provide copies of the "Watercolors" video and the viewer's guide to Task Force members. If desired, members will provide comments on the video, viewer's guide and magazine article (see handouts) directly to the Water Education Foundation. Task Force members will give YFWO copies of their comments, if any.**

**\*\*Assignment\*\* Yreka FWO will research requirements of Washington, D.C. review of any videos funded by the Task Force, as was required 9-10 years ago. Staff will report back on results.**

Laurie Simons then provided a brief program update. She reviewed *Agendum 4, Handout L*, which shows that projects are relatively well on track with spending funds. She then brought everyone's attention to *Agendum 4, Handout M*, as requested by Joan Smith.

### **Agendum 5a. Old Business. Status of Klamath River Flow Study**

John Engbring explained that the Senate Budget was recently released requesting \$750,000 for the Klamath Flow Study and \$500,000 for the Trinity Flow Project. John Engbring said this is a good sign, as it is a reference point during the budget negotiation process. Bob Davis, BOR, said there was \$2 million requested for flow studies (\$1 million for the Klamath upper basin and \$1 million for the Klamath River) in the FY2001 budget. These were removed, probably by the OMB, and there is currently nothing in the budget for flow studies. Mike Orcutt said he would encourage Task Force members to give their input on this issue.

#### **Agendum 5b. Old Business. Status of appointment letters**

John Engbring has received his appointment letter. He added that appointment letters have not been received for the following members: Mike Rode, Dave Bitts, Kent Bulfinch, (all from State of CA), Elwood Miller, Jr. (Klamath Tribe), Al Olson (Dept. of Agriculture) and Mike Orcutt (Hoopa Tribe). He urged these members to ask their representing associations to send these letters.

#### **Agendum 5c. Old Business. Status of funding for Klamath flow gauges**

John Engbring said this is an ongoing issue. (*see Handout Agendum 5*) He said there are at least three gauges that will not be funded. The letter has been sent to science members of the DOI. John Engbring said there is an option for the Task Force to fund some of these gauges. Joan Smith reiterated the importance of funding these gauges. This issue will be discussed later in the meeting.

#### **Agendum 6. Report from the Klamath Fishery Management Council**

Keith Wilkinson stressed the importance of the work of the Klamath Fishery Management Council (KFMC), and expressed concern about the chair's absence at several meetings, particularly recent meetings, particularly recent meetings in Portland. The Chair, Dr. Mary Ellen Mueller, was not able to attend the meeting because of work in the Trinity River region. Keith Wilkinson said that KFMC needs to have a chair who understands and abides by the commitment of the work involved, and that he wanted to go on the record as expressing his concern on this issue. Paul Kirk said there is a disconnect and a lack of consistency which badly affects the work of KFMC. John Engbring said that he would discuss this issue with the Chair of the KFMC.

**\*\*Assignment\*\* Chair John Engbring will discuss the issue of chair meeting attendance with the KFMC chair, and report back to the Task Force at the October meeting in Yreka.**

#### **Agendum 7. Klamath River Water Quality Modeling Project**

Michael L. Deas, Ph.D, UC Davis, thanked the Task Force for funding the project and the Klamath Basin TWG for their help. He briefly outlined the three key issues: Water quality parameters of interest, the water quality processes and management options. The Project HP-96-01, is called Assessment of Alternatives for Flow and Water Quality Control in the Klamath River below Iron Gate Dam. He defined the tasks of the project, which included developing river

and reservoir morphology, identifying riparian vegetation and conducting field surveys of water quality conditions, among other tasks, and said the final report contained a great deal of background information.

He discussed the key issues of water quality parameters of interest: temperature, dissolved oxygen, ammonia and other factors (nutrients P and N, algae and pH, alkalinity, etc.). He also discussed the water quality processes in Iron Gate Dam, such as residence time, seasonal thermal loading/stratification, algae production and hypolimnion anoxia (absence of oxygen). He explained the issue of residence time of water in the reservoir; if water remains for a long time in the reservoir, this can lead to little or no oxygen at lower levels. If there is no oxygen, ammonia starts to accumulate at the bottom of the reservoir, and when this is released into the river, suffocation and ammonia poisoning of fish may occur. Regarding the water quality processes of the river, it was found that Iron Gate Dam water affects the river 35 miles downstream as well. In 1997, two water quality probes were installed which show that Klamath River has high temperatures as well as high levels of ammonia. This summer the project will investigate whether reservoir releases are creating enrichment downstream of Iron Gate Dam.

The conclusion was reached that the reservoir is creating adverse water quality conditions for the river. Management options were discussed, but restricted to the issue of temperature control. Using 1997 baseline conditions, options studied included flow modification and reservoir modification with selective withdrawal and modified storage as possibilities. Preliminary analysis says that increasing the flow into Iron Gate Dam would increase temperature. Only increased storage and selective withdrawal were found to keep release temperature at less than 20 Celsius. Moving the water quickly through the system will keep the temperatures lower.

Recommendations included the following: recognizing that there are no easy answers, such as removing the dam or increasing/decreasing flows. The current situation is the result of 100 years of accumulated impacts, such as logging, power production, mining, etc. Michael Deas said it was important to revisit the original questions in light of the report finding and identify specific objectives and assessment measures. The project also recommended implementing a water quality monitoring program, implementing an attached algae assessment program, exploring ecological monitoring and extending the models downstream as well as upstream, specifically to Copco Reservoir.

In conclusion, he said the project is currently conducting water quality monitoring, funded by BOR, on about 210 miles of river in the Klamath Basin. These include semi-monthly grab samples, water quality probes and temperature monitoring, among other studies. He said they were not able to find ecological studies of the river, which is a huge part of salmon restoration. There are probably 300-350 species of algae between Iron Gate and Seiad river that have never been studied. He has also recently submitted a proposal to study the Trinity River.

For further information, Micheal Deas can be contacted at [mjbdeas@jps.net](mailto:mjbdeas@jps.net).

### **Task Force Comment**

- Mike Rode asked what would be the single greatest benefit for water quality in this area. Michael Deas responded that first the fate of the fish hatchery would have to be decided. Options of removing dams or increasing their storage would be complicated and should be modeled. If Iron Gate Dam could be raised it may help salmon and keep the hatchery running.
- Keith Wilkinson asked about adding water to the reservoir. Michael Deas said this is not a clear solution as water sitting in the reservoir for long periods of time may adversely affect fish due to decreased water quality.
- Don Russell asked if problems downstream would still occur if algae were eliminated in the upper Klamath Lake. The response was that phytoplankton are windborn, and transported vast distances. If the right conditions are provided, algae will exist.

### **Agendum 8. Status of Klamath Project and Long-Term EIS**

Bob Davis, BOR, spoke, as Karl Wirkus was not available. He provided the schedule for the Long-Term plan EIS, and information on the FY 2000 operations plan. (*see Handouts Agendum 8*) He said that the warm, dry conditions of June resulted in a 25% higher-than-average irrigation use. He said upper Klamath Lake elevation is decreasing by .04 feet per day. BOR is sending a letter to water users encouraging them to conserve; BOR expects this will help meet levels identified in the plan for both the lake and river.

Bob Davis also discussed BOR's acquisition in 1997 of the 7,000-acre Agency Lake Ranch. This property is being utilized to take water from the system when it is in a spill mode. The water is then given to Agency Lake, which is connected to upper Klamath Lake. The BOR has been able to realize 15,000 acre feet of water, which has helped to maintain lake elevation in upper Klamath Lake.

Bob Davis then discussed the EIS. He said a large amount of information is being collected on suckers and coho, and this is being used to guide the EIS, in consultation with NMFS and USFWS, in order to develop alternatives. He reviewed the schedule and said there should be a draft EIS available for public review by January 1, 2001. He mentioned the Cooperative Agency Agreement meeting on July 13 in Redding, CA.

### **Task Force Comment**

- Keith Wilkinson asked about the Agency Lake Ranch acquisition and any possible levy modifications. Bob Davis said there are two levies with private neighbors that limit this to 15,000 acre feet of storage. If the levies are removed, this could be raised to 40,000 acre feet. If the neighboring properties could be acquired, this would be less expensive than building levies; however, this is not possible at this time.
- Mike Rode asked about the supply in two reservoirs, Gerber and Clear Lake. Bob Davis said the BOR doesn't plan to take water from the reservoirs. Dave Hillemeier noted that in the operations plan, there are minimum levels and target levels, and asked what science led to

the minimum levels. Bob Davis said, because of the pending lawsuit, he is not able to comment on that. He suggested Task Force members refer to the letter dated April 26, 2000 regarding Klamath River Flows below Iron Gate Dam/2000 Operation Plan-Klamath Project. (*see Handout Agendum 8*)

- Mike Orcutt asked, in light of budget cuts, what would be BOR's commitment. Bob Davis said the amount of money for scientific projects has been reduced.
- Ronnie Pierce said she assumes that there is not sufficient water to meet target flows, given the request for water users to conserve.

### **Agendum 9. Public Comment**

- Michael Deas commented on several points raised during the meeting. He noted that there are technical errors in the *Western Water* magazine article. (*see Agendum , Handout I*). He suggested that a more complete technical description could be posted on the FWS Website. He also noted that only the Upper Klamath Lake is discussed in the article. He will provide comment to FWS staff to pass onto the authors of the article.

Felice Pace, Klamath Forest Alliance, commented on several items. He asked if the April 5 letter from the Klamath Fisheries Management Council (*see Agendum 4, Handout C*) had been answered. He also noted that the April 26 letter (*see Handout Agendum 8*) cc list included private organizations such as PacifiCorps, but not a non-profit group such as Klamath Forest Alliance. He said only certain groups are afforded the opportunity to see correspondence, and this is a possible violation of the law since private corporations such as PacifiCorps are not allowed to be part of the cooperative process. Alluding to the letter from the Scott River Watershed Council (*see Agendum 4, Handout B*), he said the Klamath Forest Alliance is skeptical of the Siskyou RCD's ability to address the issues of fish restoration and include all interests in the basin. Discussing the "Watercolors" video, he said his group had no opportunity to review the video or be part of the interview process. He suggested that the Task Force should not pay the \$40,000 owed. He complimented the presentation by Mike Deas, but said upstream research must be conducted to receive a total picture of the problem. He said taking out the dam might be easier, politically and technically, than raising the dam. The assumption of constant temperature irrespective of flows should be looked at to see if this is a valid assumption. He said the agencies involved should host local presentations by Dr. Deas to inform the public.

### **Agendum 10. Report from the Long-term Funding Subcommittee**

Keith Wilkinson said there are no meetings of the subcommittee scheduled at this point. He said strategies and policies must be decided, given the increasing funding requests. He is waiting for the FY2003 process to begin. He said there was a \$7.5 million annual request that he believes did not include administrative costs. He believes the best strategy is to ask for more and receive less. The next meeting will not be scheduled until the budget process is complete. He said a question-and-answer strategy needs to be developed once a budget request amount is decided upon. He said he plans to put together a well-developed, well-timed strategy to hit key non-government

and government people when the timing is right. He said whatever amount is agreed upon, the subcommittee must look at good political counsel on how to achieve this amount.

### **Task Force Comment**

- John Engbring said there is the general feeling that putting together a budget during election year is a fruitless endeavor and that FY2003 would be the earliest time to put together a budget. He said given this budget request, only an act like the Klamath Act would make this happen. The best hope for such funding would be from the outside.
- Ronnie Pierce said she wanted to clarify that the Task Force was originally funded for \$20 million for 20 years, which expires 2006. If the Task Force receives \$1 million a year until then, the Task Force will be shortchanged \$3 million, as there was a 3-year lapse before the Task Force was actually funded. This \$3 million could be funded over the last three years.
- Dave Hillemeier said Klamath and Trinity Basins could be combined for funding.
- Kent Bulfinch said that many of the objectives that were once funded by different agencies have been dropped and the Task Force has picked up more and more responsibilities. He suggested that a list of all these new projects now being funded by the Task Force be drawn up and included in any budget request process. Such a break-out list might mitigate the effects of any request for increased funds. Keith Wilkinson added that all unfunded projects could be added as well.
- Mike Orcutt said issues of monitoring should be addressed. He asked about the outcome of the November 1999 meeting with Keith Wilkinson and Mary Ellen Mueller.

### **Agendum 11. Emerging Roles/Issues for Watershed Councils in Salmonid Restoration**

The presentation by Jacqueline Dingfelder, For the Sake of the Salmon, was moved to the following day.

### **Agendum 12. California Department of Fish and Game Fishery Restoration Grants Program**

Larry Week, Department of Fish and Game, was fogged out and therefore unable to attend. Mike Rode explained the handout (*see Handout Agendum12*) which is a list of all restoration projects in the Klamath Basin funded by the State of California for 1999. He said this will enable the Task Force to make better informed budget decisions.

**\*\*Assignment\*\* Yreka FWO will invite Larry Week, CA Department of Fish and Game, to speak at the October 2000 meeting on the department's Fishery Restoration Grants Program.**

### **Agendum 13. Draft Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement for the Cascade Siskiyou Ecological Emphasis Area.**



Keith Wilkinson spoke about the EIS for the Cascade Siskiyou Ecological Emphasis Area. He said this was of concern to the Task Force as there are eight or nine tributaries flowing into the Klamath Basin within this area. He said that monument designation will require more restrictive controls on the tributaries and this will impact the Klamath River.

He expressed his concern about the lack of input in the EIS from Task Force members and said few people knew about the comment period, which ended June 14. John Engbring said the BLM will have to do another EIS given the new monument status.

#### **Agendum 14. Task Force Review of Recommendations from Mid-term Evaluation Oversight Committee**

Task Force members were asked to review the Agendum 14 handouts, including two letters from the KFMC on Mid-Term Evaluation recommendations, recommendations from the Mid-Term Evaluation Oversight Committee and a portion of the TWG minutes on this topic. (*see Handouts Agendum 14*) Dave Hillemeier and Ronnie Pierce explained that the mid-term evaluation was contracted out and returned with recommendations. A subcommittee reviewed the document and decided upon the process for the Task Force to review the recommendations. Ronnie Pierce gave the Task Force a seven-page synopsis of recommendations. She asked Task Members to review the Draft Process sheet that recapitulates the original seven-page document that she gave the Task Force in October 1999. She reviewed some items which must undergo discussion. The Task Force decided to address as many items as possible during this meeting and discuss the rest in subsequent Task Force meetings. Decisions were reached on the following items:

Item PA 4c. Adopt a new structure for the Long-Range Plan. This was deferred until later.

Item PA 7b. Use a contracted consultant for a Klamath Restoration Newsletter. This is already being done.

Item 4c2. Establish the Long-Range Plan as the recognized program for recovery of ESA species. The Long-Range Plan is unlikely to be established as the NMFS Recovery Plan, but it will be used as guidance. Don Reck said it should be noted that the long-term plan will be an important component, but not the only component, of the NMFS Recovery Plan.

Item 1-4. Identify stable source of fish monitoring funding. This is being pursued.

Item PA 1a. Recognize and confront contentious issues. There was agreement on this.

Item PA 1a. Schedule workshop on consensus process. It was decided that discussing issues would be more valuable at this time to the Task Force than consensus process training in a workshop or retreat setting. However, such training may be valuable in the future.

Item PA 1a. Contract a facilitator when necessary. It was decided not to discuss having a facilitator until a specific issue required one.

Item PA 1a. Discontinue Robert's Rules of Order. It was decided to go forward with business

done as usual.

Item PA 1a. Foster commitment of Task Force membership to goals of restoration. There was complete agreement on this issue.

Item PA 7c. Task Force should promote use of KRIS. The sub-basin groups currently use KRIS. This is endorsed but difficult to fund.

Item PA 10. Task Force Action Item minutes should be keyed for data base sorting. The minutes are now being done in a different format that allows action items to be placed on a separate page that is easily accessed by Task Force members.

Item SD-6. Explore using salmon recovery funds to acquire water rights from willing sellers as per SB-301. The Task Force could not own water rights, but would have to act as a pass-through agency. The language should be changed to “explore using any available funds” rather than just salmon recovery funds. It was decided to recognize the intent of this but realize the Task Force cannot acquire water rights.

Item S-1. Encourage sub-basin interests to work cooperatively with agencies to meet TMDL objectives. This is already being done.

Item WC-4. Encourage local basin interests to cooperate with USFS in planning for large public land tracts. This is already being done and should be expanded to include the BLM.

Item MTH-1a. Work to keep fish population data in KRIS current. If there are proposals to keep fish population data current, they should be ranked with other proposals. It was noted that the specific reference to KRIS should be dropped.

Item MAG-2. Continue to use all available tools to monitor riparian recovery. The Task Force agreed with this.

Item MF-1. Continue to fund and seek long-term funding for flow gauge operations. The Task Force agrees on the importance of the flow gauges and will continue to seek long-term funding.

Item MFH-3. Pursue full funding for instream flow needs study for all life stages of salmonids. This is being done and the Task Force will continue to do this.

Item E7. Jointly sponsor conference on riparian restoration and increase water use efficiency. This has not been done so far, but the Task Force would cooperatively support such efforts. The language should be changed from “jointly sponsor” to “support.” The Task Force should consider all appropriate educational conference proposals, particularly one that includes Shasta and Scott participants. Ronnie Pierce is planning a symposium for spring 2001 on fish and water issues and Task Force sponsorship should be considered.

Item E-9. Ask Yurok Tribe about creating an interpretive center adjacent to estuary at lower Hunter Creek. The Task Force will do this.

**\*\*Assignment\*\* Yreka FWO will research groups that are implementing SB-301, which provides funding for purchase of water rights in California for conservation efforts. The Central Valley groups that are currently implementing the law will be looked at to explore how this law could be applied to the Klamath basin.**

#### **Task Force Comment**

- Mike Orcutt said it is important to consider the needs of other species that are not included in the long-range plan; these need to be considered and integrated before looking at recovery efforts. The existing multiple plans in existence need to be integrated as well. John Engbring said the needs of coho must be explored. Kent Bulfinch recommended looking at the list. Ronnie Pierce asked if Task Force members think this process should be handled during a Task Force meeting or should a special workshop be set up. John Engbring said he would rather address these issues during normal meetings, and there was general agreement on this. He said a basic working plan would be to defer to NMFS and their recovery plan before remodeling the long-range plan of Task Force. Keith Wilkinson said it was more appropriate for the subcommittee to incorporate all recommendations before presenting them to the Task Force.
- Ronnie Pierce asked that the Task Force take some actions as recommended in the Mid-Term Evaluation. This led to the following assignments:

**\*\*Assignment\*\* Don Reck will report to Task Force members on the outcome of the NMFS internal meeting on salmon recovery planning, held June 28-29 in Santa Rosa. He will supply this information in a timely manner, if necessary, or by arranging for a presentation by NMFS representatives at the October 2000 meeting in Yreka.**

**\*\*Assignment\*\* Robbie Van de Water will review recommendations of the Mid-term Evaluation Oversight Committee and draft a letter to the U.S. Forest Service for Task Force signature regarding implementation of the Northwest Forest Plan.**

**\*\*Assignment\*\* Don Reck will report to the Task Force at the next meeting about mining issues that affect salmon restoration.**

**\*\*Assignment\*\* Yreka FWO staff will ask representatives from the California Department of Fish and Game and the California Department of Forestry to speak to the Task Force on the DFG code and Forest Practice rules in relation to salmon restoration issues.**

**\*\*Assignment\*\* Yreka FWO will include an agenda for the October 2000 meeting to review additional remaining items in the Mid-Term Evaluation.**

#### **Agendum 15. Public Comment**

Jeffy Davis-Marx, Scott River Watershed Council Coordinator, said she is aware of several facilitators with reasonable rates (i.e. Dr. Betsy Watson in Arcata) who would be willing to lead a workshop on consensus procedure.

Felice Pace, Klamath Forest Alliance, said it was important to note that the Northwest Forest Plan mandated that the Cascade Siskiyou be identified as a special area. He wanted it noted that although Siskiyou County is 65% federal land, that leaves a lot of private land, including 300,000 acres of timber land. He said that several groups including the Farm Bureau, Siskiyou County, and KFA cooperated with BLM in developing a plan whereby federal land ownership would be consolidated in certain areas in order to address water quality issues on a large scale; some of these areas are Jenny Creek, Klamath Scenic Canyon and others. Federal land would be consolidated in exchange for privatizing nearly 40,000 acres in other areas of the county. Felice Pace said that to date 17,000 acres have been privatized with more than 21,000 acres in process. He said that there has been a net increase of private land in Siskiyou County and that the other half of the plan was to consolidate large pieces of federal land so that water quality issues could be addressed. Felice Pace said that because Siskiyou County is attempting to block this part of the plan, water quality issues may not be addressed.

#### **Agendum 16. Shasta Wetlands Easement/Acquisition Project**

- John Engbring discussed the Shasta Wetlands Project, which is sponsored by the FWS. This area has been identified as one of the primary productivity areas for salmon in the Klamath system, particularly for Chinook. The plan is to restore the Shasta River to some of its former productivity in order to move ahead with salmon restoration. FWS has broad authority to enter into agreements with landowners, acquire land, establish conservation easements, etc. One of the problems working with private landowners is that it is very expensive for landowners to fence off riparian areas when there is no economic gain to them. The solutions are to acquire the land outright or enter into easement agreements along the streams. This is a controversial issue. He said the question remains open whether the public is willing to fund this kind of effort as it is uncertain how this impacts the tax base. There is a fear among private landowners that their land would be taken from them; John Engbring stressed this is a willing seller process and the program emphasizes compensation to landowners. He said private landowners are compensated at full appraised value. The first meetings will be held in the late summer/early fall 2000.

#### **Task Force Comment**

- Joan Smith said the Siskiyou Board of Supervisors has a policy of no net-loss of private lands because of the loss of tax base. She said 65% of Siskiyou County land is federally managed. She encourages the use of more incentive-based options such as a compensation program rather than outright purchase of private lands.
- Paul Kirk said Humboldt County also has a no net-loss program and would look more favorably at conservation easement programs than at outright acquisition of private land. This type of program must be looked at carefully with lots of public education. Landowners are skittish in northern California about more federal management of lands because many conservation programs have failed.
- Keith Wilkinson said there is a waiting list in Oregon for applicants for conservation

easement programs.

- Kent Bulfinch said that there is concern among private landowners that their land will be used without compensation. He suggested that landowners could retain ownership but be compensated for use of their land.

### **Agendum 17. Conservation Reserve Program**

Randall Seelbrede, National Resource Conservation Service, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, spoke about his agency's Conservation Reserve Program. For the past 60 years, the program has primarily provided ranchers and farmers with conservation technical assistance. The program has 3,000 offices nationwide with an office in every county helping land-users, tribes, etc. with planning and implementing of conservation systems. About 80% of the program is discretionary allocation for work with private landowners on planning, implementation and financial aid. He mentioned different programs within his department, such as the Wetlands Reserve Program, the Wildlife Habitat Improvement Program and the Forestry Incentives Program, which are all reviewed by Congress.

He said that the majority of funding in Siskiyou County is given to the two geographic priority areas of the Shasta River Basin and Scott River Basin. He outlined the Wildlife Habitat Incentives program which focuses on riparian areas. He said the Wetlands Reserve Program is very popular in California's Central Valley and involves easements (10-year, 30-year and perpetuity). There is a 20-25% match by private landowners. Beginning in 1999, the Conservation Reserve Program will be used to focus on riparian areas. The goal is 2 million miles of riparian buffer strips; currently the program has reached 600,000 miles. Randall Seelbrede explained specific regulations within this program and said it has been modified to include marginal pasture land (rather than crop land) as long as it is adjacent to a waterbody. The contract with landowners is 10 to 15 years. It is a rental agreement, not an easement or acquisition. This contract requires that the buffer zone is not grazed or harvested during the contract period and this includes the neighboring cattle. In the past, the program was restricted to paying landowners \$30 per acre, but new incentives have raised this to \$67-\$72 per acre annually in Siskiyou County. Each county has its own rental rate, but all contracts are the same and are non-negotiable. Randall Seelbrede stressed that this program will not solve habitat problems, but is a stewardship option.

**June 29, 2000**

**Reconvene**

The same members were present as on the first day

**Agendum 11. Emerging Roles/Issues for Watershed Councils in Salmonid Restoration**

Jacqueline Dingfelder, For the Sake of the Salmon (FSOS), said the group was formed in 1995 as an umbrella group of members from 60 organizations working to develop a common vision on salmon issues in Oregon, California and Washington. The organizations are government, private, utilities, environmental, tribal and other non-profit groups. Current projects are the watershed support program and Salmon Friendly Power, which creates a source of funding from private entities for salmon recovery by supporting salmon-friendly power sources. The Watershed Support Program goals are: to promote a scientifically-based watershed approach region-wide, to act as a liaison between watershed groups and state and federal agency staff, to disseminate the most recent and most useful technical and scientific information, and to promote a multi-stakeholder model. (*see Handouts Agendum 11*).

She said the group is currently working with NMFS Northwest Region to organize workshops on salmon recovery. She said the group offers a free e-mail information sheet, "FSOS News" and a website [www.4FSOS.org](http://www.4FSOS.org) that is updated every 2 weeks, as well as low-cost and free workshops and networking forums, including a recent free seminar on developing effective outreach for watershed groups, held in Auburn, CA. FSOS also offers direct technical assistance and a liaison program, and could potentially assist the 90 active recognized watershed councils in Oregon. She defined a watershed council as a locally organized, voluntary, non-regulatory group that assesses the condition of the watershed and develop a plan to address problems. Watershed councils can provide the following: promote a holistic view of the watershed, improve the relationship between government agencies and the community, create a more efficient use of financial and human resources, and generate new ideas and information.

Ms. Dingfelder spoke about the challenges facing watersheds. These include small financial support for the size of the problem, a lack of resources and the need for scientific and technical resources necessary for developing a strong conservation plan. Another challenge for watersheds is the NMFS decision that watershed restoration plans must be approved by the state; FSOS is working with watershed groups to help them develop their restoration plans. Ms. Dingfelder concluded her talk by reiterating that FSOS is a valuable resource for watershed groups and others working for salmon restoration.

**Addendum 16. Shasta Wetlands Easement/Acquisition Project**

This was discussed the previous day.

**Agendum 17. Conservation Reserve Program**

This was discussed the previous day.

### **Agendum 18. Dept. of Fish & Game Steelhead Research and Monitoring Program**

Mr. Phil Bairrington, California Department of Fish and Game, spoke about the department's Steelhead Research and Monitoring Program. The program was founded in early 1999 as part of a cooperative agreement with NMFS. He said the Steelhead program crosses regional boundaries and covers projects on the Klamath, Shasta, Scott and Trinity rivers. The Klamath projects include the following: three studies, Klamath Juvenile and Adult Index Reaches, Klamath River Residualism and Klamath half-pounder radio tracking. He listed a total of 24 studies and said there have been as many as 33 studies at one time. This has equaled 31.6 person years in research time which translates to a large number of people working in the field.

He listed several projects below:

- Smith River: Rowdy Creek Hatchery Marking. This assists hatchery personnel in marking 100% of the steelhead production. The Smith River Creel Census determines angler use and harvest of naturally and hatchery-produced steelhead.
- Scott and Shasta Rivers: Scott and Shasta River Juvenile Steelhead Trapping, which determines migration patterns and growth of naturally-produced juvenile salmonids. Mr. Bairrington described four ways of marking and tagging fish, including photonic-tagging of steelhead.
- Klamath River: Half pounder life-history study. This covers the half-pounder steelhead in the Klamath River Estuary. He also mentioned the Iron Gate Hatchery Steelhead Residualism study and the Klamath River Basin Steelhead Abundance Indices.
- Trinity River: Studies include the Trinity River Upper Steelhead Census, the Trinity River Tributary Spawner Survey, the Trinity River Hatchery Steelhead Residualism Study and the Trinity River Tributary Juvenile Steelhead Abundance Indices.
- Mad River: Studies on this river include the Mad River Hatchery Adult Recovery, the Mad River Adult Run-size Estimates, the Mad River Creel Census, Mad River Spawner Surveys, Mad River Hatchery Marking and Mad River Juvenile Steelhead Trapping.

Mr. Bairrington discussed the weirs and traps used to trap and tag steelhead in an effort to monitor steelhead abundance. He also mentioned other additional comprehensive projects, which include compiling literature (local and international), scale analysis and steelhead tissue collection. There are about 45 DFG staff (part-time and full-time) and the department plans to open an office in Crescent City. The program is 100% preservation funded. He said the program will not be effected by budget cuts and he hopes the program will run four to five life cycles of the steelhead.

### **Agendum 19. Reports from Sub-basin planning Groups on progress of sub-basin planning**

**and restoration efforts and future proposed work**

Six Sub-basin Planning groups presented their annual reports. These reports were comprehensive outlines that detailed progress to date, restoration efforts and future plans. Each of the six presentations, with Task Force comments, follow below:

**Scott River Sub-basin/Jeffy Davis-Marx**

Ms. Jeffy Davis-Mark, Watershed Coordinator, Scott River Watershed Council, gave the State of the Council Report 2000. (*see Handout Agendum 19*). She showed a map of water temperature monitoring sites and explained the area encompassed by the 800-square mile Scott River Watershed. She said the success of the organization is largely due to active community involvement.

She described the organization of her group, which meets monthly with additional committee, executive and technical meetings. The decision making process is made up of a super-majority with consensus as the fallback. Everyone in Scott Valley can be a member of the watershed council—the council is the community.

The Council's educational programs consist of workshops and field trips for the community, such as the Juniper Management Workshop, the Landowner Sediment/Water Quality Monitoring Project, the Grange Management Workshop and the Forestry Stewardship Workshop. She outlined the Etna Union High School Watershed Education program.

Ms. Jeffy Davis-Marx described the Fish Screen Construction project which monitors 135 diversions, with 27 screened by the California Department of Fish and Game, 15 by the Siskiyou RCD with 6 student-built tubes and 9 self-cleaning locally built.

The Riparian Protection and Planting project has helped ensure that 80% of Scott mainstem is now fenced. RCD has built 20 miles of fencing since 1994. The project has accomplished 160 acres of riparian planting since 1994, with varying rates of survival. Trench planting success rates are better.

Instream projects include stabilization and complexity improvement such as the Fay Lane Project. Water conservation programs including stockwater systems and irrigation management with 20 landowners participating. Road Related Sediment Reduction projects have achieved 15 miles of road rehabilitation at a cost of \$220,000.

The planning schedule was discussed next. The Council is working on a “cookbook strategy” by gathering all pertinent planning information from June 2000 to January 2001. A technical writer/planner will be contracted to put together a plan, working from January 2001 to January 2002, if funding is received. There are plans for an annual State of Watershed Report. Ms. Davis-Marx said the group's successes include obtaining funding, restoration activities, bringing more people into the process and the educational programs. She said there is a need to improve the ongoing planning process and that the group needs help with assessment. Monitoring programs will begin summer 2000.



### Task Force Comment

- Paul Kirk said he appreciated the “cookbook” approach of collecting data for community use. He asked about matching funds and Ms. Davis-Marx said there are matching funds of \$61,000 in her proposal that are being sought through SB-271 from the California Department of Fish and Game.

### Salmon River Sub-basin/Peter Brucker

Peter Brucker, Restoration Coordinator for Salmon River Sub-basin opened his presentation by describing his 500,000-acre watershed, which is 99% federally managed land and 1% private land. The Karuk Tribe has 67% of its ancestral territories in the watershed. He described some of the education programs in three local schools, such as the 43 Hobo Temps devices. He said a limiting factor of this watershed is its remote location and that key influences are flooding and fire. The watershed is the most fire-prone area in the Klamath Basin, and the Salmon River Sub-basin is mounting several fire-preparation programs. He said the Salmon River restoration strategy has been a collaborative effort of the Salmon Learning and Understanding Group (SLUG), made up of USFS, Dept. of Fish and Game, Siskiyou County, Klamath Forest Alliance, the Karuk Tribe and others interested in restoration efforts.

The group has a draft plan currently available for comments. This plan is currently prioritizing watershed planning efforts, such as high-priority drainage areas. The plan is focussed on the upslope because it affects aquatic habitat. Roads are being looked at, as is the issue of restoring fire back to the system. Noxious weed management is a growing issue, as they prevent recovery of native plants. Other issues include the effects on the river of the mining industry and the increase in water recreation activities, such as whitewater rafting.

Peter Brucker then outlined the Sub-basin’s Planning Restoration Strategy. He said the priorities are assessing problems created by roads, the effect of mining tailings on water temperatures, and logging and fire management. Monitoring of fish populations is being considered. Juvenile fish monitoring is a possible priority, as to date only adult fish are being monitored. Vegetation assessment is about 60% accurate, and this needs to be more accurate. The Salmon River needs a fire plan. Also, management of logging practices such as clearcutting, is being assessed. He described the Restoration Council Roads Workshop, attended by County Roads, USFS and equipment operators. He described the Spring Chinook Count, which is a popular, cooperatively sponsored spring chinook and summer steelhead survey. He said the Salmon River is probably the premier place in the Klamath Basin for spring chinook. He said the Watershed Council is currently assessing whether fish counts should be part of its restoration plan. The Sub-basin’s website address is [www.srdcc.org](http://www.srdcc.org).

### Task Force Comment

- Paul Kirk asked Peter Brucker where the sub-basin has applied for matching funding. The answer was that the state matches federal funding and this has been pursued. This year, the sub-basin has a \$400,000 budget, and at least \$150,000 will be volunteer, which shows the high level of volunteer input.

## **Lower Klamath Sub-basin/Dan Gale**

Dan Gale, biologist with the Yurok Tribe, opened his talk by stressing that Yurok tribal members have been fishing for thousands of years. He described the sub-basin as 25 anadromous tributaries draining into the Lower Klamath, rather than simply a watershed. The Sub-basin has one primary landowner, Simpson Timber Company, therefore the issues center around logging, not mining or agriculture. The challenges are extensive timber overharvesting in the 1950s and 1960s and an abandoned road network with old logging roads sliding into creeks. This, added to high precipitation rates of 80 to 100 inches a year, steep, highly erodible soils and little existing data, compounds the difficulties of restoration work. Dan Gale described the Lower Klamath River Tributary Watershed Assessment, which includes both physical and biological assessment of 250 miles of tributaries, including in-channel habitat and riparian conditions. The group felt that the upslope assessment was a priority in order to deal with these challenges.

Dan Gale described the group's partnership with Simpson Timber Company, which began six years ago, and has led to the sub-basin being allowed to assess upslope conditions and road networks. He said 200 miles of habitat have been assessed during the past two years. This includes large woody debris assessment, flow monitoring and water quality assessment. Turbidity is a big problem. He said the group's challenges are upslope restoration work and road decommissioning. The sub-basin group also plans to look at anadromous fish diversity, channel conditions, habitat connectivity, number of stream crossings and road density with a vision of "protect the best, restore the rest."

## **Mid-Klamath Sub-basin/Toz Soto**

Toz Soto, Mid-Klamath Sub-basin Coordinator, described the group's planning steps. The group is currently developing its Phase 2 plan. The Phase 1 plan has been in circulation for more than a year, with public meetings being held. Phase 1 goals are education, communication, cooperation and habitat restoration and to develop the final Middle Klamath River Sub-basin Plan, followed by public comment, implementation and monitoring. The Phase 2 draft plan will be available for comment in November 2000. The plan will be finalized by January 2001 and the final report should be finished February 1, 2001.

He said the sub-basin is faced with some of the same challenges of other watershed groups. The area is mostly federal land, split between the Klamath National Forest and Six Rivers National Forest. Major stakeholders include the Karuk Tribe, U.S. Forest Service and Siskiyou County. Karuk Tribe ancestral territories comprise more than half the area. He said timber is a prize resource, major recreation use is growing and Forest Service budget cuts mean many roads are not being maintained. This has led to road failures, fish passage problems and water quality issues.

The Karuk Tribe has taken the lead in some of the group's larger restoration projects. The Watershed Education Program includes water quality testing, sub-basin temperature monitoring and riparian habitat exploration. Toz Soto said restoration has been a band-aid approach to date but the goal now is to conduct an ecosystem analysis. He described the Ishi-Pishi/Ukonom Ecosystem Analysis, which calls for decommissioning 70 miles of roads and upgrading and

maintaining other roads systems. He gave as an example the Steinacher Creek Road Decommissioning Project with more than \$1 million from eight sources of funding. The Thompson Creek/Seiad Grider Ecosystem Analysis calls for decommissioning 107 miles of road. In conclusion, he said the sub-basin is trying to develop a long-term approach to solving problems.

### **Shasta River CRMP/Sub-basin/Dave Webb**

Dave Webb, Shasta CRMP Coordinator working with the Shasta River Sub-basin, stressed that the sub-basin's challenges can only be understood by realizing that the land mass is comprised of the largest lava debris flow on the planet and includes one of the driest areas of California. The area does not have problems of roads or erosion and Mt. Shasta snowmelt keeps the Shasta River cold enough to maintain salmon. The area is comprised of many individual landowners with mostly private land ownership, dissected into a multitude of small pieces. He said landowner response to salmonid restoration has been varied and projects have included monitoring sites and livestock exclusion fences. Much of the work done has been through volunteer (both high school student and adults) groups. These include tree plantings, monitoring, pulse flows, tree-wrapping to minimize beaver damage and fish screen development. Dave Webb said the Shasta River probably has the largest load of floating aquatic material, which means well-developed tube screens are needed. These are low-cost and can be used as a model for the rest of the state of California.

Dave Webb said factors affecting the decline of fish populations include access to habitat, flow, water quality, geomorphology, watershed and upslope processes, biological interactions, microhabitat limitations, stream diversions, groundwater, accidental mortality, out-of-basin factors and thermal refugia. He said the group needs to set priorities to determine the most effective way to implement salmon restoration. He outlined how the Shasta River CRMP plans to do this. (*see Handout Agendum 19*).

Dave Webb asked Pete Townley to discuss monitoring efforts of the Shasta Sub-basin; he gave a rundown of projects funded and sources of funding (*see Handout Agendum 19*). The important events of the last year include funding of a dam replacement with a self-cleaning screen. This was done on private land, and the ranchers involved now maintain the screen themselves. He said a similar dam removal on the Applegate River cost \$1.5 million, whereas this removal cost only \$60,000.

Dave Webb closed his presentation by saying the Sub-basin needs more funding for outreach education. The group is looking at federal salmon restoration funding and expressed appreciation of Task Force funding.

### **Agendum 20. Public Comment**

Felice Pace, KFA, said that it was good to see substantial progress in all of the sub-basins. He then spoke about the concerns of his organization with the sub-basin plans, particularly the Scott River Sub-basin. He believes the Scott River plan does not include important issues which are not politically acceptable, such as dewatering of streams, overallocation of water, or pumping of

interconnected groundwater. He believes the sub-basins should be funded at the base level but the sub-basin plans should be subject to peer review. He is concerned that staff is attending political meetings and commenting on political letters and asked who is paying them to do politics. He expressed concern about the Patterson Creek Project, which he said may benefit landowners more than fish.

Jeffy Davis-Marx, Scott River Watershed Council Coordinator, stressed that issues differ for each watershed throughout the Klamath Basin and she appreciated the opportunity to come present her information to the Task Force. Responding to Felice Pace's comments, she suggested community members should attend Scott River Sub-basin meetings rather than address remarks to the Task Force.

Dr. Yvonne Everett, HSU, addressed questions that have been directed to her by the Task Force. She said she has completed placing all existing GIS data on the Web. Future work to update the Website will depend on funding. She described the strategic planning process, which she said was originally based on the assumption that sub-basin plans were complete. Because this was not the case, the timetable moved at a different pace. She said HSU can support the planning processes of both the Shasta and Scott River Sub-basin groups. The Salmon River Sub-basin group was approached but they have their own process. HSU is also working with both the Mid-Klamath and Lower Klamath sub-basin groups. She concluded by saying HSU can also play a supporting role by coordinating a Klamath Basin Symposium and by helping the Task Force in its goals.

#### **Agendum 21. TWG Report: FY2001 Proposal Ranking and Workplan Recommendations**

Dan Gale opened his presentation by pointing out that James Wroble's resignation as TWG chair left the group without a leader. He said he is confident a new chair will be chosen at the next meeting. He discussed TWG attendance and said that only half of the group attends regularly and it is the same people attending. The situation has deteriorated recently with high turnover, low attendance and missing seats. He said that many members attend only when it is time to rank proposals and this is counterproductive to making informed decisions. He said the idea of weighting votes against attendance has been discussed. John Engbring encouraged all Task Force members to encourage their TWG representatives to attend meetings.

The TWG is reviewing all of the sub-basin plans. The decision was made to address each sub-basin plan by a field visit at a TWG meeting, followed by a plan review at the following meeting. TWG began with a field visit to the Shasta Sub-basin in January, followed by plan review in April. A field visit to the Scott River Sub-basin occurred in April, with plan review scheduled for August. The field visit to the Lower Klamath Sub-basin is scheduled for August.

Dan Gale discussed the mid-program review. He encouraged Task Force members to review recommendations from TWG on the mid-term evaluation recommendations. (*see Handout Agendum 21.*) He said TWG can give more input on this at the October 2000 Task Force meeting.

Discussing the proposal ranking, Dan Gale said TWG is disturbed by the Task Force's decision

to change priorities, as TWG has put in so much effort in the RFP and proposal ranking process. He said TWG would like more of a time commitment from the Task Force on the proposal ranking process. He concluded by saying that TWG recommends funding each sub-basin a set amount of \$25,000.

### **Task Force Comment**

- Joan Smith thanked Dan Gale for the update and the TWG members for their hard work. She then stressed that it is the Task Force's responsibility to decide what to fund.
- Keith Wilkinson expressed concern about low attendance at TWG meetings.
- Paul Kirk recommended that the Task Force Chair look at the charter to ascertain the process of ensuring attendance at TWG meetings. He said he is concerned about further deterioration of TWG attendance as TWG is the Task Force's on-the-ground voice.
- John Engbring said it is the responsibility of each Task Force member to communicate with each TWG representative about meeting attendance and content. If there is a problem, this person should be replaced. Mike Rode agreed, as did Joan Smith, who said Task Force members should receive minutes from the TWG meetings, by e-mail, if possible.

**\*\*Assignment\*\* Paul Kirk will research the Task Force Charter language and work with the Yreka FWO to explore ways to increase attendance at TWG meetings.**

**\*\*Assignment\*\* Task Force members will identify their TWG representatives and bring those names to the October 2000 Task Force meeting**

**\*\*Assignment\*\* Yreka FWO will post minutes from the TWG meetings on the FWS Website.**

### **Agendum 22. Task Force Workplan Discussion and Decision**

John Engbring said no decisions were reached at the Budget Committee meeting held two days previously. (*see Handouts Agendum 22*). However, the committee members are aware of proposal rankings and projects to be funded. TWG asked for \$25,000 for each sub-basin with the remainder in Category 2b for additional planning. The Karuk Tribe did not realize there was this option so did not submit a proposal for sub-basin planning. Joan Smith said her alternate, Jim De Pree, developed a proposal for funding that took all these issues into account.

Jim De Pree spoke to the group on his proposed budget plan. They are as follows:

- He said he was able to create additional funds for Category 3 as Dave Webb removed two Shasta Valley fencing projects (potential other funding sources could include state and federal salmon funds). This left a total in Category 1 of \$59,156 for a surplus of \$114,454. He said he was attempting to create a surplus in Categories 1 and 2 to create enough funds in Category 3.

- Category 2: He took TWG recommendation of \$25,000 to each group for coordination and then made sure each group had sub-basin planning funds.
- Category 3: At the budget committee meeting it was suggested to combine FP01 and FP07 for a total of \$40,884. Jim De Pree added in other projects that were considered top priorities which created a deficit of \$107, 177, but by adding in the surpluses from Categories 1 and 2, this created a surplus of \$25,958 which could be used for flow gauges and other important projects.

### **Task Force Comment**

#### **Category 2**

There was agreement on Category 2a, but much discussion followed about Category 2b. Under Jim De Pree's plan for Category 2b, HSU would not be funded.

- Joan Smith said HSU has been very helpful to the sub-basin groups but she believes other funding sources are available to HSU. Therefore she supports Jim De Pree's Category 2b recommendation.
- Ronnie Pierce said the Task Force should be aware of the investment it has put into the GIS process and a small component should be kept going.
- Paul Kirk said \$175,000 is available in Humboldt County for GIS funding and they are looking for collaborative efforts.

**\*\*Motion\*\* Paul Kirk moved to approve Categories 2a and 2b as stated on Jim De Pree's proposal.**

**\*\*Second\*\* Joan Smith seconded the motion.**

**\*\*Motion Carried\*\* unanimously.**

#### **Category 3**

- Robbie Van De Water said the Forest Service would withdraw its proposal (FP-07) if the following contingencies were not met: two tribes as cooperators, money dispersed directly and agreement on program of work in future. There was agreement among the Task Force members on this.
- Dave Hillemeier said the cooperative agreement has worked well in the past. Paul Kirk said that combining FP-07 and FP-01 will cost \$54,000 not the \$40,884 written on Jim De Pree's proposal.
- Dave Hillemeier said he could not agree with the Yurok Tribe's Terwer Creek Watershed Restoration project not being funded.
- Joan Smith discussed the Shasta River Flow project (HP-03) and said she is opposed to

reducing the funding to \$71,000 for what she termed a critical project.

- Dave Hillemeier said he is concerned about setting the precedent of having proposals go through the ranking process only to be potentially dropped during budget discussions.
- Ronnie Van De Water said the Task Force should look more carefully at the process in the future. John Engbring responded by saying that some projects need to be dropped in order to meet the budget.

### **Task Force Comment**

- Dave Hillemeier said he is not willing to pull funding on the Terwer Creek projects.
- Paul Kirk said projects can not be dropped without offering groups submitting proposals the chance to withdraw or accept lesser funding.
- Paul Kirk said he does not support the HSU project being funded by Task Force and there is a collaborative process for HSU making it possible for the project to receive funding from another source.
- Don Reck said he was curious to know why the Bogus Creek Salmon Study project was recommended to be dropped, as this was one of the projects that the Klamath Fishery Management Council identified as important.
- Joan Smith said in attempting to cover everyone's needs, the Budget Committee took a hard look at all projects to decide which could be funded by other sources.
- John Engbring said there is a high probability that fencing and on-the-ground projects will be funded by the state's \$9 million salmon restoration fund, and the Task Force should take this into account when deciding what to fund.

After further discussion failed to generate agreement, John Engbring said he would take responsibility for resolving the differences between Categories 1 and 3 in the first part of July.

**\*\*Assignment\*\* John Engbring will create 2001 Work Plan by July 7 and distribute it to Task Force members.**

### **Public Comment**

- Ross Taylor explained the ranking of different sub-basin groups and their requests for funding.
- Felice Pace said separating planning from coordination is a good idea, but perhaps sub-basin groups should be treated equally when it comes to planning in Category 2b.
- Dan Gale said that the GIS work done by HSU is vital to the lower-Klamath region being

able to accomplish its restoration plan. He requested that Task Force members consider this.

- Dan Gale expressed concern about further reduction of funding for on-the-ground proposals.
- Felice Pace read from the Task Force Charter and said that Chapter 1, Section 2a says the Management Council will monitor and evaluate. He pointed out that surveys on the Salmon River are not being funded, but are being done by volunteers, and this can be replicated in other places. He stated that there appears to be a problem furnishing management information with the Act.
- Dave Webb said it is important to have a process and stick to it, but that when TWG ranked the proposals there wasn't \$9 million in federal monies available. He strongly encouraged the Task Force to remember the importance of having scientific surveys before making decisions.
- Sam Williamson, USGS, commended the Task Force for its work, and said that it is important to remember that just because the Task Force does not fund a project does not mean it will not receive funding. It is important that the Task Force provides guidance of what should be funded in the basin.

**Agendum 23. Recap and summary of assignments and motions.**

John Engbring summarized the list of assignments and motions. (*see attached list*).

**Agendum 24. Date and Location for October 2000 meeting.**

The October 2000 meeting will be held on October 18 and 19 in Yreka, CA. The next Task Force meeting will be held February 8 and 9, 2001 in Brookings, OR.

**Adjourn**



Attachment 1

***GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS  
KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE  
MEETING  
June 28-29, 2000  
Best Western Bayshore Inn  
Eureka, CA***

Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office - AFWO  
Bureau of Indian Affairs - BIA  
Bureau of Reclamation - BOR  
California Department of Fish and Game - CDFG  
California Department of Water Resources - DWR  
Coded Wire Tags - CWT  
Coordinated Resource Management Planning - CRMP  
Ecosystem Restoration Office - ERO  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission - FERC  
Irongate Dam - IGD  
Klamath Basin Water Users - KBWU  
Klamath Fisheries Management Council - KFMC  
Klamath Forest Alliance - KFA  
Long Range Plan - LRP  
Memorandum of Understanding - MOU  
National Marine Fisheries Service - NMFS  
Pacific Power and Light - PPL  
Request for Proposals - RFP  
Siskiyou Resource Conservation District - RCD  
Task Force - TF  
Technical Advisory Team - TAT  
Technical Work Group - TWG  
Trinity Coordinating Committee - TCC  
U.S. Department of Agriculture - USDA  
U. S. Department of Interior - DOI  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - FWS  
U.S. Geological Survey - USGS  
Upper Basin Amendment - UBA  
Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office - YFWO

***KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING  
FINAL AGENDA  
June 28-29, 2000  
Best Western Bayshore Inn  
Eureka, CA***

June 28, 2000

- |         |   |
|---------|---|
| 9:00 AM | 1. Convene and opening remarks. John Engbring, chair and Mike Rode, vice chair.   |
| 9:15    | 2. Introductions of Congressional staff in attendance   |
| 9:30    | 3. Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Adoption of agenda</li><li>b. Adoption of minutes from February 2000 meeting</li><li>c. Vice chair for next meeting is Kent Bulfinch</li></ul>                           |
| 9:45    | 4. Brief review of last meeting actions/general correspondence/program update (Simons)  |
| 10:00   | 5. Old business <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Status of Klamath River Flow Study (Engbring)</li><li>b. Status of appointment letters</li><li>c. Status of funding for Klamath flow gauges (Robert Mason)</li></ul> |
| 10:15   | 6. Report from the Klamath Fishery Management Council (Kirk)  |
| 10:30   | 7. Klamath River Water Quality Modeling Project (Mike Deas, Ph.D.)  |
| 11:15   | 8. Status of Klamath Project and long-term EIS (Karl Wirkus, Reclamation)   |
| 11:45   | 9. Public Comment   |
| 12:00   | Lunch   |
| 1:00    | 10. Report from the Long-term Funding Sub-committee (Wilkinson)   |
| 1:15    | 11. Emerging Roles/Issues for Watershed Councils in Salmonid Restoration (Jacqueline Dingfelder, For the Sake of the Salmon)  |
| 2:00    | Break   |
| 2:15    | 12. California Department of Fish and Game Fishery Restoration Grants Program   |

**Draft Minutes Klamath Task Force Meeting June 28-29, 2000**

(Larry Week, Department of Fish and Game)

- 2:45 13. Draft Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement for the Cascade Siskiyou Ecological Emphasis Area. (Wilkinson)
- 3:00 14. Task Force review of recommendations from Mid-term Evaluation Oversight Committee (Belchik)
- 4:45 15. Public Comment
- 5:00 Recess
- 5:00 - 7:00 Social Hour - in Marie Callender's Lounge

June 29, 2000

- 8:00 16. Shasta Wetlands Easement/Acquisition Project (Engbring)
- 8:30 17. Conservation Reserve Program (Randall Seelbrede, NRCS)
- 9:00 18. Department of Fish and Game Steelhead Research and Monitoring Program (Phil Bairrington, DFG)
- 9:30 19. Reports from sub-basin planning groups on progress of sub-basin planning and restoration efforts and future proposed work
- a. Scott River Sub-basin (Jeffy Davis-Marx)
  - b. Salmon River Sub-basin (Peter Brucker)
  - c. Lower Klamath Sub-basin (Dan Gale)
- 10:30 Break
- d. Mid-Klamath Sub-basin (Toz Soto)
  - e. Shasta River Sub-basin (Dave Webb)
  - f. TF discussion
- 11:45 20. Public Comment
- 12:00 Lunch
- 1:00 21. TWG Report: FY2001 Proposal Ranking and Workplan recommendations (Dan Gale)
- 1:30 22. Task Force Workplan discussion and decision
- 2:30 23. Recap and summary of assignments and motions (Engbring)
- 2:45 24. Scheduling future meetings: next meeting is October 18 and 19, 2000 in

Yreka. Where and when is the February meeting?

3:00 Adjourn

Attachment 3

***KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE MEETING  
June 28-29, 2000  
Final List of Handouts***

- |             |  |
|-------------|--|
| Agendum 4A  | Letter to Terry Garcia, Subject: Recovery Plan for Southwestern Oregon/Northern California Coastal Coho Salmon Evolutionarily Significant Unit, dated February 8, 2000 |
| Agendum 4B  | Letter to Ron Iverson, from the Scott River Watershed Council, dated March 24, 2000  |
| Agendum 4C  | Letter to Karl Wirkus, from the Klamath Fisheries Management Council, dated April 5, 2000  |
| Agendum 4D  | Letter to Mary Ellen Mueller, from National Marine Fisheries Service, dated April 10, 2000   |
| Agendum 4E  | Letter to Sub-basin Planning Coordinators, from Project Leader, Yreka FWO, dated May 24, 2000.   |
| Agendum 4F  | Letter to Task Force Chairman, from Technical Work Group Chairman James Wroble, dated May 30, 2000   |
| Agendum 4G  | Letter to Rita Schmidt Sudman, from Ron Iverson YFWO, dated June 8, 2000   |
| Agendum 4H  | Letter to DOI Science Board Members from John Engbring, dated June 20, 2000  |
| Agendum 4I  | Water Education Foundation Draft Article, "The Klamath River Basin - A Microcosm of Water in the West", dated June 21, 2000  |
| Agendum 4J  | Letter to Ron Iverson from the Water Education Foundation, dated June 26, 2000   |
| *Agendum 4K | (Added at the Meeting) Letter to Ron Iverson from Sen Dianne Feinstein, dated June 28, 2000  |

- Agendum 4L Task Force Unspent Projects 3-Year Cutoff as off June 13, 2000
- Agendum 4M Assignments and Motions to the Technical Work Group, for the last two years, as of June 26, 2000
- Agendum 5 Klamath River Basin USGS streamgage funding report
- \*Agendum 7 (Added at the Meeting) Klamath River Modeling Project (slide extracts)
- \*Agendum 8 (Added at the Meeting) Klamath Project Long-Term Operations Plan EIS Schedule (as of 03/13/00)
- \*Agendum 8 (Added at the Meeting) Letter to NMFS from BOR dated Apr 26, 2000
- \*Agendum 8 (Added at the Meeting) Klamath Project 2000 Annual Operations Plan
- \*Agendum 11 (Added at the Meeting) fsos-news
- \*Agendum 11 (Added at the Meeting) Background on For The Sake of the Salmon
- \*Agendum 11 (Added at the Meeting) Brochure, Watershed Support Program
- \*Agendum 11 (Added at the Meeting) Brochure, For the Sake of the Salmon
- \*Agendum 12 (Added at the Meeting) CDFG Grants, FY 99 for Klamath River Basin
- Agendum 14 Letter to Task Force Chairman, Subject: Midterm Review of the Klamath Long Range Restoration Plan, dated February 2, 2000
- Agendum 14 Letter to Task Force Chairman, from the Klamath Fisheries Management Council, dated May 17, 2000
- \*Agendum 14 (Added at the Meeting) Draft Process for Proceeding with Recommendations of the Mid-Term Evaluation
- \*Agendum 14 (Added at the Meeting) Extract of TWG Minutes re: MTE
- \*Agendum 19 (Added at the Meeting) DRAFT: Limiting Factors to Healthy Watersheds and Healthy Anadromous Fish Populations in the Scott Valley
- \*Agendum 19e (Added at the Meeting) DRAFT: Matrix of Potential Limiting Factors for the Shasta River (4/11/2000)
- \*Agendum 19e (Added at the Meeting) Table, Project Status of Shasta CRMP Projects
- \*Agendum 19e (Added at the Meeting) Preliminary Outline of Shasta Watershed

Restoration Plan

- Agendum 21            FY 2001 Proposals Ranked by the Technical Work Group Table
- Agendum 21            FY 2001 Proposal Ranking Recommendations for Category 2 by the  
Technical Work Group Table
- Agendum 22            Task Force FY 2001 Budget Allocation Table
- \*Agendum 22            (Added at the Meeting) Jim DePree's Proposed Budget Numbers

Informational Handouts

Letter to Karl Wirkus, Bureau of Reclamation from Donald B. Koch, California Department of Fish and Game, April 14, 2000.

MOU regarding the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Program between CDFG and NMFS, May 10, 2000.

Siskiyou Daily News, February 18, 2000, "Hatchery salmon slaughter is needless madness"

Siskiyou Daily News, February 23, 2000, Article, "Bulfinch calls for harvesting of sea lions at mouths of rivers"

Siskiyou Daily News, March 2000, License on Klamath River set to expire"

The Oregonian, March 4, 2000, Article "Clubbing of salmon unleashes outrage"

The Columbian, March 8, 2000, Article "Thomas: It's too late for some salmon"

Siskiyou Daily News, March 21, 2000, Article "It's a Bird, it's a plane, it's...?"

Siskiyou Daily News, March 23, 2000, Editorial, "USF&W squandered millions of our dollars"

Siskiyou Daily News, March 29, 2000, "Doesn't want Parker clones"

Siskiyou Daily News, March 31, 2000, "Video increases debate over hatchery salmon vs wild"

Siskiyou Daily News, April 7, 2000, Opinion Page "It's all part of giant conspiracy"

Siskiyou Daily News, April 12, 2000, Article, More about fish hatcheries, "Review is under way"

Siskiyou Daily News, May 3, 2000, Opinion Page "Viewpoints on the mid-Klamath fishery"

Pioneer Press, May 3, 2000, Article "Scott River Watershed Report", by Jeffy Davis-Marx

Siskiyou Daily News, May 4 2000, Article “Support withdrawn for Tribe fishery”

Siskiyou Daily News, May 5, 2000, Opinion Page “Just what is a steelhead?”

Siskiyou Daily News, May 19, 2000, Article “FERC want comments on dam in county”

Siskiyou Daily News, June 8, 2000, Article, “Enviros file lawsuit against Bureau of Reclamation”

E-Mail copy of a Letter to U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Jim Bryant), from California Department of Fish & Game (Michael Rode), dated May 18, 2000.

Siskiyou Daily News, June 20, 2000, Article “Hatcheries mark steelhead to set them apart”

Siskiyou Daily News, June 21, 2000, Article “DFG will eliminate New York brown trout”

Pioneer Press, June 21, 2000, Article “Records will be the key to dealing with water issues”

Times-Standard Editorial, “Don’t expect much benefit from listing of steelhead”

Action Alert: “A Critical Time for the Future of the Klamath River”

***LIST OF ATTENDEES***

***KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE  
MEETING  
June 28-29, 2000***

The following individuals attended the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force Meeting in Yreka, CA, on June 28-29, 2000.

June 28, 2000

<b><u>Name</u></b>	<b><u>Representing</u></b>
Dan Gale	Yurok Tribe/TWG
Renee Stauffer	Karuk Tribe of California
Tessa Stuedli	Klamath Water Users Assoc.
Merv George Jr.	Klamath River Inter-Tribal Fish and Water Commission
Jim DePree	Siskiyou County
Earl Danosky	Tulelake Irrigation District
Randall Seelbrede	USDA-NRCS-Siskiyou Co.
Bruce Halstead	USFWS-Arcata FWO
Jeffy Davis Marx	Scott River Watershed Council
Mike Deas	U. C. Davis
Tom Shaw	USFWS-Arcata FWO
George Guillen	USFWS-Arcata FWO
Glen Spain	Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman's Association
Jacqueline Dingfelder	For the Sake of the Salmon
Maggie Peters	Karuk Tribe of California - Self Government
Sam Williamsen	U. S. Geological Survey, Biological Resources Div.
Mary Knapp	USFWS-Arcata FWO
Jim Simondet	National Marine Fisheries Service
Jim Waldvogel	KRTF-TWG (Del Norte Co.)
Felice Pace	Klamath Forest Alliance
Philip Barrington	CDFG
Carlin Finke	Self
Peter Brucker	Salmon River Restoration Council
Toz Soto	Karuk Tribe



June 29, 2000

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Frank Pesniciano	Bureau of Reclamation
Jim De Pree	Siskiyou County
Joan Smith	Siskiyou County
David Webb	Shasta CRMP
Dan Gale	Yurok Tribe/TWG
Randall Sellbrede	USDA-National Resource Conservation Service
Earl Danosky	Tulelake Irrigation District
Philip Bairrington	CDFG
Carlin Finke	Self
Ronald Iverson	USFWS-Yreka FWO
Leaf Hillman	Karuk Tribe
Troy Fletcher	Yurok Tribe
Peter Townley	Shasta CRMP
Ross Taylor	Humboldt County-TWG
Tessa Stuedli	Klamath Water Users Assoc.
Dara Pearson	Salmon River Restoration Council
Toz Soto	Karuk Tribe
Felice Pace	Klamath Forest Alliance
Sam Williamson	U. S. Geological Survey
Jim Simondet	National Marine Fisheries Service
Douglas Parkinson	Douglas Parkinson & Associates
Merv George, Jr.	Klamath River Inter Tribal Fish and Water Commission
Yvonne Everett	Humboldt State University
Kelly Helstrom	NCIDC
Renee Stauffer	Karuk Tribe

S:\ALL\TFfile\MTG-MIN\JUNE\2000\Draft Jun 2000 Minutes with attachments WP.wpd

**ASSIGNMENTS AND MOTIONS**

**KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE**

**MEETING**

**June 28-29, 2000**

**Best Western Bayshore Inn**

**Eureka, CA**

**Assignments:**

**Agendum 4**

**\*\*Assignment\*\*** Yreka FWO will provide copies of the "Watercolors" video and the viewer's guide to Task Force members. If desired, members will provide comments on the video, viewer's guide and magazine article (in handouts provided at this meeting) directly to the Water Education Foundation. Task Force members will give Yreka FWO copies of their comments, if any.

**Agendum 4**

**\*\*Assignment\*\*** Yreka FWO will research requirements of Washington, D.C. review of any videos funded by the Task Force, as was required 9-10 years ago. Staff will report back on results.

**Agendum 6**

**\*\*Assignment\*\*** Chair John Engbring will discuss the issue of chair meeting attendance with the KFMC chair, and report back to the Task Force at the October meeting in Yreka.

**Agendum 12**

**\*\*Assignment\*\*** Yreka FWO will invite Larry Week, CA Department of Fish and Game, to speak at the October 2000 meeting on the department's Fishery Restoration Grants Program.

**Agendum 14**

**\*\*Assignment\*\*** Yreka FWO will research groups that are implementing SB-301, which provides funding for purchase of water rights in California for conservation efforts. The Central Valley groups that are currently implementing the law will be looked at to explore how this law could be applied to the Klamath basin.

**Agendum 14**

**\*\*Assignment\*\*** Don Reck will report to Task Force members on the outcome of the NMFS internal meeting about salmon recovery planning, held June 28-29 in Santa Rosa. He will supply this information in a timely manner, if necessary, or by arranging for a presentation by NMFS representatives at the

Task Force October 2000 meeting in Yreka.

14

ent\*\* Robbie Van de Water will review recommendations of the Mid-term Evaluation Oversight Committee and draft a letter to the U.S. Forest Service for Task Force signature regarding implementation of the Northwest Forest Plan.

14

ent \*\* Don Reck will report to the Task Force at the next meeting about mining issues that affect salmon restoration.

14

ent \*\* Yreka FWO will ask representatives from the California Department of Fish and Game and the California Department of Forestry to speak to the Task Force on the DFG code and Forest Practice rules in relation to salmon restoration issues.

14

ent\*\* An agenda will be created for the October 2000 meeting to go over more items in the Mid-Term Evaluation.

21

ent\*\* Paul Kirk will look at the Task Force Charter language and work with Yreka FWO to explore ways to increase attendance at TWG meetings.

21

ent\*\* Task Force members will identify their TWG representatives and bring those names to the October 2000 Task Force meeting in Yreka.

21

ent\*\* Yreka FWO will post minutes from the TWG meetings on the FWS Website.

22

ent\*\* John Engbring\*\* will create a 2001 workplan by July 7 and distribute it to the Task Force members.

### tions:

### ndum 3a

otion\*\* Keith Wilkinson moved to adopt the amended agenda.

**\*\*Second\*\*** Don Russell seconded the motion.  
**\*\*Motion Carried\*\*** unanimously.

**Agendum 3b**

**\*\*Motion\*\*** Keith Wilkinson moved to adopt the amended minutes of the last meeting.

**\*\*Second\*\*** Don Russell seconded the motion.  
**\*\*Motion Carried\*\*** unanimously.

**Agendum 22**

**\*\*Motion\*\*** Paul Kirk moved to approve Categories 2a and 2b as stated on Jim De Pree's proposal.

**\*\*Second\*\*** Joan Smith seconded the motion.  
**\*\*Motion Carried\*\*** unanimously.